```
BEFORE THE
1
             ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
2
 3
                               )
    IN THE MATTER OF:
    ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE
 4
    COMPANY (SBC ILLINOIS)
    AND ERNEST
    COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
    Joint Petition for
                               )
    Approval of Negotiated ) NO. 03-0679
7
   Interconnection
    Agreement dated
                               )
    September 9, 2003,
8
    pursuant to 47 U.S.C.
 9
   Section 252.
10
11
                     Chicago, Illinois
12
                     December 3rd, 2003
13
           Met pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m.
14 BEFORE:
       Mr. Ian Brodsky, Administrative Law Judge.
16 APPEARANCES:
       JAMES A. HUTTENHOWER
       225 West Randolph Street, Suite 25-D
       Chicago, Illinois 60606
18
            for Illinois Bell Telephone Company (SBC);
19
       MS. BRANDY D.B. BROWN
       160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
20
       Chicago, Illinois
            for the staff of the Illinois Commerce
21
            Commission.
22 SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
   Kathleen Maloney, CSR
```

- JUDGE BRODSKY: Pursuant to the authority of the
- 2 Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call Docket
- 3 03-0679, Illinois Bell Telephone Company
- 4 (SBC/Illinois) and Ernest Communications, Inc.
- 5 Joint petition for approval of negotiated
- 6 interconnection agreement dated September 9, 2003,
- 7 pursuant to 47 USC Section 252.
- 8 May I have the appearances for the record
- 9 please.
- 10 MR. HUTTENHOWER: James Huttenhower appearing on
- 11 behalf of Illinois Bell Telephone, 225 West Randolph
- 12 Street, Suite 25-D, Chicago 60606.
- 13 MS. BROWN: Brandy D.B. Brown on behalf of the
- 14 staff of the Illinois Commerce Commission, 160 North
- 15 LaSalle, Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois 60601.
- 16 JUDGE BRODSKY: Okay. Thank you.
- 17 Okay. Has staff filed a verified
- 18 statement?
- 19 MS. BROWN: No. Staff has not filed a verified
- 20 statement in this matter.
- 21 The party Ernest Communications is in the
- 22 process of receiving their certificates, and it is

- 1 pending at this time.
- 2 Staff -- while staff anticipates there is
- 3 no impediment, we would like to continue this matter
- 4 until it is issued.
- 5 JUDGE BRODSKY: Do we know when the
- 6 certification is likely to be issued?
- 7 MS. BROWN: It is likely to be issued
- 8 January 17th.
- 9 JUDGE BRODSKY: Okay. Given that there is a
- 10 deadline on this case which is too close to January
- 11 17th, so rather than continue, this matter should be
- 12 dismissed without prejudice, I believe, and refiled
- 13 when it is ripe for Commission action after the
- 14 party Ernest Communications Incorporated has been
- 15 certified as a telecommunications provider.
- Is there any comments from SBC?
- 17 MR. HUTTENHOWER: I, you know, -- we are willing
- 18 to do whatever the Commission wants to do in this
- 19 regard. There has been no communication from Ernest
- 20 to us to know how they feel about this situation.
- 21 JUDGE BRODSKY: Okay. Well, in light of that,
- 22 it sounds like there is not any particular objection

- 1 to taking this course of action. So that's what it
- 2 is that we are going to do.
- 3 The Commission will eventually see an
- 4 order dismissing this application for approval
- 5 without prejudice.
- Is there anything else that we need to
- 7 note for the record at this point?
- 8 MS. BROWN: No.
- 9 MR. HUTTENHOWER: No.
- 10 JUDGE BRODSKY: Okay. So what I am going to do
- 11 is continue this matter generally, and I will send a
- 12 proposed order to the parties fairly soon, and we'll
- 13 go from there.
- 14 Thank you very much.
- 15 (Whereupon, the hearing in the
- 16 above matter was continued
- 17 generally.)
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22